

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11, 14, and 26-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 26-30 have been amended to correct formal matters and to conform to U.S. practice. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following comments.

Non-substantive Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 26, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being unclear. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully point out that a discussion of examining resource provider reliabilities is provided on page 9, lines 1-25. Examples of resource provider reliabilities include a capital provider's financial records with a bank, a claim of ownership to a building or land, or a potential resource provider's education and background. Please see page 9, lines 14-20.

Applicants respectfully submit that a person skilled in the art would understand how to receive and certify resource provider items. In order to clarify claim 1, however, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 26 to recite certifying a resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

The Examiner also expressed confusion regarding the phrase "matching said resource provider according to said record of said resource provider with other certified resource provider having a record saved in said electronic hub system." Claims 1 and 26 have been amended to clarify that matching said resource provider includes searching records of certified resource providers saved in an electronic hub system database and matching the records with records of other certified resource providers stored in the database. Please see, e.g., page 8, lines 7-14 and page 10, lines 1-16.

Formal rejection has also been made to the phrase "collecting and analyzing said resource providers certified; and implementing matches and business plans for said resource providers certified according to similarities to business models of said resource providers certified to complete founding establishment of resource related to a company or factory." In particular, the Examiner expressed confusion regarding the phrase "resource providers certified." Applicants submit that a resource provider certified is a resource provider that has been examined and

passed the examination. To better clarify this point, claims 1, 5, 6, 26, 28, and 29 have been amended to recite "certified resource providers."

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection with respect to claims 1 and 26 is overcome and request withdrawal of the rejection. No new matter has been added.

Regarding claims 6 and 29, the Examiner has expressed confusion regarding the phrase "defining a priority of said business plans according to similarities to said business models of said resource providers certified." As noted above, the phrase "resource provider certified" has been amended to "certified resource provider" for the sake of clarity. The priority of a business plan is defined or determined according to similarities to the business models of the certified resource providers. Logically, the more similar the business model is to the business models of the other certified resource providers, the higher the priority of the business model.

Similarly, "sending said business plans to said resource providers certified" includes sending the business plans to the certified resource providers. In one example embodiment, the business plan is displayed on a website. See, e.g., page 11, lines 25 to page 12, line 3.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection with respect to claims 6 and 29 is overcome and request withdrawal of the rejection. No new matter has been added.

Substantive Claim Rejections

Claims 1-7, 11, 14, and 26-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. publication No. 2001/0047276 to Eisenhart. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention recites a method for efficiently matching resources required to establish businesses and business facilities through the Internet. The method includes providing an electronic hub system configured to communicate with at least one resource provider. The method further includes examining a plurality of items of a resource provider to certify the resource provider as being able to provide at least one of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

In contrast, Eisenhart discloses facilitating collaboration between a technology supplier and a technology buyer over a network. In Eisenhart, members register by providing contact

information. "The process to qualify potential member '305 includes verifying the contact information for potential members or completing a financial transaction." See Eisenhart, paragraph [0045]. The ability of the members to provide particular services is not certified or even determined. In particular, Eisenhart does not disclose or suggest certifying resource providers as being able to provide at least one of capital, land, building rental, management groups, rules and regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans.

For at least these reasons, Eisenhart does not teach every limitation of the claimed invention and does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2-7, 11, and 14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

Claim 26 also recites examining a plurality of items of said resource provider to certify said resource provider as being able to provide at least one selected from the group consisting of capital, land, building rental, management groups, regulations, administrative ideas, and business plans. Eisenhart, therefore, does not anticipate claim 26 for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants do not otherwise concede the correctness of the rejection and reserve the right to make additional arguments if necessary.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.



Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. H. Batzli", written over a horizontal line.

Brian H. Batzli
Reg. No. 32,960

Date: January 4, 2006

BHB:JKS/ck